

1 Jayne W. Williams, Esq. (SBN:63203)  
2 jwilliams@meyersnave.com  
3 Deborah J. Fox, Esq. (SBN: 110929)  
4 dfox@meyersnave.com  
5 Philip A. Seymour (SBN: 116606)  
6 pseymour@meyersnave.com  
7 Kimberly M. Drake, Esq. (SBN: 209090)  
8 kdrake@meyersnave.com  
9 MEYERS, NAVE, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON  
10 555 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1500  
11 Oakland, California 94607  
12 Telephone: (510) 808-2000  
13 Facsimile: (510) 444-1108

14  
15 Attorneys for Defendant  
16 CITY OF SAN LEANDRO  
17  
18

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 INTERNATIONAL CHURCH OF THE  
14 FOURSQUARE GOSPEL,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 CITY OF SAN LEANDRO, a municipal  
18 corporation,

19 Defendant.

20  
21  
22 FAITH FELLOWSHIP FOURSQUARE  
23 CHURCH,

24 Real Party in Interest.

Case No. C07-03605-PJH

DEFENDANT CITY OF SAN  
LEANDRO'S NOTICE OF MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OR  
IN THE ALTERNATIVE FOR  
SUMMARY ADJUDICATION OF  
CLAIMS

Hearing:

Date: October 1, 2008

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Courtroom: 3

Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton  
Complaint Filed: 7/12/07

1 TO PLAINTIFF AND ITS ATTORNEY OF RECORD:

2 NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on October 1, 2008 at 9:00 a.m., or as soon  
 3 thereafter as the matter may be heard by the above-entitled Court, located at 450 Golden  
 4 Gate Avenue, Courtroom 3, San Francisco, California, Defendant City of San Leandro  
 5 ("the City") will and hereby does move the Court for an order granting its Motion for  
 6 Summary Judgment or in the Alternative for Summary Adjudication of Claims as to each  
 7 cause of action (First through Ninth) stated in First Amended Complaint for Violation of  
 8 Constitutional Rights and the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act, 42  
 9 U.S.C. § 1983; 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc.

10 This motion for summary judgment or in the alternative summary adjudication is  
 11 made on the grounds that there are no genuine issues as to any material fact and that the  
 12 moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of the law because:

13 1. The actions of defendant City have not imposed any substantial burden on  
 14 plaintiff's exercise of religion within the meaning of the Religious Land Use and  
 15 Institutionalized Persons Act ("RLUIPA"). Further, the City's actions challenged by  
 16 plaintiff were the least restrictive means available for achieving a compelling government  
 17 interest, specifically preservation of land for industrial and commercial development  
 18 necessary to provide jobs and sustain the local economy.

19 2. The regulations and actions of defendant City challenged in this lawsuit did  
 20 not and do not violate the "Equal Terms" provisions of RLUIPA (42 U.S.C. §  
 21 2000cc(b)(1)). The City regulations do not, and the City has not, treated plaintiff or  
 22 churches generally differently than other similarly situated assembly or institutional use  
 23 within the meaning of RLUIPA.

24 3. The City has not totally excluded nor unreasonably restricted religious  
 25 assemblies and institutions within its boundaries in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc(b)(3).  
 26 The City's regulations provide ample opportunities for the location of churches and other  
 27 religious assemblies and institutions within the City.

28 4. The City has not interfered with plaintiff's exercise of religion in violation of  
 the Free Exercise clause of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

5. The City has not interfered with plaintiff's freedom of speech in violation of the Free Speech clause of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

6. The City has not interfered with plaintiff's freedom of assembly in violation of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

7. The City has not interfered with plaintiff's freedom of association in violation of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution'

8. The City has not denied plaintiff equal protection of the law in violation of the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

9. The City has not denied plaintiff due process of law in violation of the Due Process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

This motion is based upon this Notice of Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities; Request for Judicial; the declarations of Debbie Pollart, Lloyd Zola, Deborah J. Fox, and accompanying exhibits; all pleadings and papers on file in this action and upon such other matters as may be presented to the Court at the time of the hearing.

Dated: August 27, 2008

MEYERS, NAVF, RIBACK, SILVER & WILSON

By \_\_\_\_\_ /s/

DEBORAH J. FOX  
Attorneys for Defendant  
CITY OF SAN LEANDRO

1140098.2  
136.5016